



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/518,276	12/16/2004	Americo Brajal	FR 020060	6681
24737 7590 11/17/2008 PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510				
EXAMINER				
MATTIS, JASON E				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2416				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/17/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This Advisory Action is in response to the Amendment After-Final filed 10/27/08. Claims 1-15 are currently pending in the application.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments filed 10/27/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding Applicant's argument that the combination Lee, Wei et al., and Roh does not teach or suggest the claim limitation "wherein a length of the IFW is greater than a channel delay spread of a transmission channel including a set of multi-paths with associated time lengths" (See page 12 of Applicant's Remarks), the Examiner respectfully disagrees. As pointed out in the Office Action mailed 8/27/08, Wei discloses selecting an IFW based on the multi-path propagation delay profile of a mobile user (See column 9 lines 38-50 of Wei et al.). Thus, Wei et al. discloses that the length of the IFW is selected based on the multi-path propagation delay time offsets, which are the channel delay spreads of a transmission channel including a set of multi-paths with associated time lengths, as claimed, since the length is the selectable parameter of an IFW (See column 9 lines 8-37 of Wei et al.). Although Wei et al. does disclose selecting the length of the IFW based on multi-path delay time lengths, Wei et al. does not specifically disclose selecting the length of the IFW to be greater than the channel delay

spread of multi-paths with associated time lengths. Roh discloses that interference can be removed for any delay time offset within an IFW (See page 1 paragraphs 11-12 of Roh). Roh also discloses using an IFW size that is selected to remove interference due to path delay time-offsets in multi-path channel environments (See page 1 paragraph 13 of Roh). Thus, based on the teachings of Wei et al. and Roh, it would have been obvious to select a length of the IFW based on a multi-path propagation delay profile of a user (as taught by Wei et al.) with the length of the IFW being selected to remove all interference due to multi-path time offsets (as taught by Roh), meaning the length must be selected to be greater than a largest channel delay spread associated time length delay in order to cancel out all multi-path delay based interference.

Regarding Applicant's argument that the combination Lee, Wei et al., and Roh does not teach or suggest the claim limitation stating "the at least two different multi-paths include a longest path having a maximum length and a shortest path having a minimum length" (See page 12 of Applicant's Remarks), the Examiner respectfully disagrees. As discussed above, Wei et al. discloses selecting an IFW based on multi-path delays and Roh discloses selecting an IFW to be large enough to cancel interference for any path delay time-offset. Thus, since the IFW is selected to cancel interference for any path delay time-offset, the IFW inherently must be at least larger than the time delay between the longest and shortest of the multi-paths, as claimed. Otherwise, all multi-path interference would not be cancelled out by the IFW. Therefore, when presented with teachings of Wei et al. and Roh, it would have been obvious to

select the length of the IFW to be greater than the time delay associated with the difference between the longest and shortest paths of a multi-path propagation profile.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JASON E. MATTIS whose telephone number is (571)272-3154. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8AM-5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Huy Vu can be reached on (571)272-3155. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jason E Mattis  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2416

JEM

/Jason E Mattis/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2416